

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-7 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been amended.

In the third paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claim 7 has been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that the ceramic plate labeled "K" in the Figure should be described in the specification. The specification has been amended so as to facilitate prosecution of the application. Therefore, the rejection has been overcome.

It is accordingly believed that the specification and the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-7 have been rejected as being obvious over Bareither et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,731,635) (hereinafter "Bareither") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

a buffer layer configured on the metal area, the buffer layer being substantially composed of nickel and having a thickness between 5 μm and 10 μm .

The Bareither reference discloses a buffer layer made of four individual layers. The buffer layer of Bareither reduces the thermal stress between the component and the carrier.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's comments on page 3 of the Office action, that the rejection over

Bareither deals with an issue (i.e. the integration of multiple pieces into one piece or conversely, using multiple pieces in replacing a single piece) that has previously been decided by the courts.

The present invention does not replace a two-piece component with a one-piece component. It is the object of the present invention to replace several different types of metal layers, as required by Bareither, with an unusually thick nickel layer. The present invention deals with a buffer layer that is made of a 5 μm to 10 μm thick nickel layer, which is used instead of a buffer layer formed of four different types of materials as disclosed by Bareither. Therefore, the case law cited by the Examiner is not applicable to the instant application.

Furthermore, the nickel layer of the present invention provides many advantages over the art, some of which are given below:

During manufacturing air cannot be enclosed in the layer disclosed in the instant application. Contrary thereto, it is possible to enclose air in the layers disclosed by Bareither.

Contrary to Bareither, there are no transitions with Ohmic or thermal transition resistances in the present invention.

Contrary to the nickel layer of the instant application, the individual layers of Bareither generate additional capacitive components at the transition between the chip and the carrier.

The reference does not show or suggest a buffer layer configured on the metal area, the buffer layer being substantially composed of nickel and having a thickness between 5 μm and 10 μm , as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The main difference between the invention of the instant application and the Bareither reference is that the instant application discloses a single-layer construction of the buffer layer. This buffer layer simplifies the construction of the circuit configuration and is novel, because the state of the art does not provide any information with regard to a single uncommonly thick nickel layer.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-7 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

June 10, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

FAX RECEIVED

JUN 10 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800